

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 24, 2003, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 18 and 20-25 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 15, 18, 20, 23 and 25 have been amended and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 18 and 20-25 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Pages 2 and 4 of the Office Action reject all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over various combinations of Huang, Fink, Monn and Morag.

Huang is directed to a photo kiosk for creating a single image from multiple images or a "computer generated synthesized sketch". The term "blending" is used to describe the synthesis. The single synthesized sketch is then printed by itself as in FIG. 1 or in a multiple up fashion as shown in FIG. 2 where indeed "different sizes" are shown. However, the different sizes are not interdependent after the printing as the multiple sizes that are produced in a zoom print producible with the present invention. In the case of the present invention, the sizes producible with the present invention are generated with a specific relationship between the original size and each ensuing size to generate a pleasing progression of sizes once disassembled (cut) from the printed sheet and reassembled as a zoomed scrapbook image on the scrapbook page. The invention of Huang is directed at how to make a single blended image from multiple images and print the single blended image in a photo kiosk. The multiple sizes shown are coincidental and have no dependency to each other after printing. Huang provides no suggestion and no motivation for a user to arrange these images in a "composite image" on another page "distinct" from the page or medium printed in the kiosk. Nor does Huang teach or suggest printing instructions for creating the composite on the "same" medium as the images.

The Examiner refers to Fink for an alleged teaching of having instructions on the same medium as the images. Fink discloses a picture pad (12) and rectangular sheets (18) that the Examiner asserts include instructions. This is not the case. With a reading of Fink at col. 2, line 66 the Examiner will note Fink says "The picture pad 12 includes a plurality of generally rectangular sheets 18, the first of which is a top sheet 20 (FIG. 2) on which instructions are imprinted..." The top sheet 20 is the instruction sheets, all the rest are the activity sheets that are distinctly without instructions. Fink does not teach or suggest a medium with images and instructions.

The Examiner uses Monn for its alleged teachings of a kit. Monn discloses making a color photocopy and manually cutting out the images to eliminate the border and gluing those to the photobox to decorate and indicate what is inside the storage box. The multiple images that Monn cuts out are completely different images not the "same" image as in the present invention. These Monn images have no relationship in size or any other characteristic and therefore do not comprise a "series." Furthermore, their arrangement on the box is random and whimsical without any recognition of any relationship to another picture except to cover the box and there is no suggestion or teaching of creating a composite image from the series of images. Nor is there a suggestion concerning instructions on the medium with the images.

Morag adds nothing to Huang, Fink and Monn with respect to the invention of the independent claims.

The combination of Huang, Fink, Monn and Morag does not teach or suggest the invention of the independent claims.

It is submitted that the invention of the independent claim distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims are patentable for the reasons set forth in the prior response. For example the prior art does not suggest mirrored images (see claim 3). It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.



Date: 9/24/3

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: J. Randall Beckers

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

RECEIVED

SEP 30 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 9/24/03 at 9:10 AM by STAAS & HALSEY
By: [Signature]
Date: 9/24/03